

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

HOUSE RESCUE CORPORATION,

Respondent,

v.

KARL THOMAS and AMBASSADOR PROPERTIES, L.L.C.,

Appellants.

DOCKET NUMBER WD71087

Date: October 5, 2010

Appeal from:
Jackson County Circuit Court
The Honorable Edith L. Messina, Judge

Appellate Judges:
Division One: Lisa White Hardwick, Chief Judge Presiding, James M. Smart, Jr. and
Alok Ahuja, Judges

Attorneys:
Cynthia C. Campbell, Esq., Kansas City, MO, for appellant.
Patrick G. Reavey, Esq., James Thomas Wicks, Esq., and Emma L. Dill, Esq.,
Kansas City, MO, for respondent.

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

COURT OF APPEALS -- WESTERN DISTRICT

HOUSE RESCUE CORPORATION,

Respondent,

v.

KARL THOMAS and AMBASSADOR PROPERTIES, L.L.C.,

Appellants.

WD71087

Jackson County

Before Division One Judges: Lisa White Hardwick, Chief Judge Presiding,
James M. Smart, Jr. and Alok Ahuja, Judges

Karl Thomas and Ambassador Properties, L.L.C. ("Intervenors") appeal a judgment denying their claim for possession of real property and damages as intervenors in an action filed under the Missouri Abandoned Housing Act ("Act"). Intervenors contend the circuit court erred in: (1) denying their claim for possession of the subject property; (2) denying their claim for a lien on the property; and (3) denying their various claims asserted under the U.S. and Missouri Constitutions and federal law.

AFFIRMED.

Division One holds: (1) The circuit court did not err in denying Intervenors' claim for possession of the subject property because Intervenors failed to demonstrate the individuals from whom they allege to have been conveyed the

property ever possessed an ownership interest in the property. (2) The circuit court did not err in denying Intervenor's claim for a lien on the property because Intervenor had notice of the competing claims on the property before incurring any expenses. (3) The circuit court did not err in denying Intervenor's constitutional claims based on lack of standing because Intervenor failed to show they possessed any interest that could be protected by challenging the constitutionality of the Act. The judgment is affirmed.

Opinion by: Lisa White Hardwick, Judge

October 5, 2010

THIS SUMMARY IS UNOFFICIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.